

ADDRESS

BY

SIR WILLIAM MACGREGOR

AT THE

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEWFOUND-
LAND AUXILIARY

OF THE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN
BIBLE SOCIETY,

IN THE COLLEGE HALL, ST. JOHN'S, ON
MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1906.

ST. JOHN'S, N. F. :
J. W. WITHERS, KING'S PRINTER.
1906.



ESK. 73

ADDRESS

BY

SIR WILLIAM MACGREGOR

AT THE

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEWFOUNDLAND AUXILIARY OF THE BRITISH
AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY,

IN THE COLLEGE HALL, ST. JOHN'S, ON MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1906.

IN a public meeting of this kind, convened for the purpose of encouraging and facilitating an increasing distribution of the Bible, the Chairman might be expected to address you on the value of the Bible to mankind, to say something of its teaching, of its history, of its interpretation. If I attempted to do so, I should perhaps be only telling you what you know already. Very probably you may be addressed by others on those subjects, by gentlemen whose profession it is to study and teach the Bible. I intend to ask your attention for a few minutes to a subject that may not encroach on the domain of other speakers, a subject that forms a somewhat difficult study. I am going to say something to you with regard to religion and religious belief as they existed in times prior to, and leading up to, our Bible.

I have, it must be confessed, some diffidence in attempting this task, because the subject is very large, it is very complicated, it is imperfectly known, and constant additions are being made to our knowledge of it. So true is this that I must ask you to remember that much that I may say to you now may be subject to early future correction.

This subject has not been selected by me out of mere academic curiosity, but with a distinct aim in view. I wish to impress on you this lesson: that what we might call the organic decrees of the Creator are, measured by the short span of human life, carried out very slowly, but with dreadful certainty. To us Christians the greatest event that has ever taken place in this world was the redemption of man by the crucifixion. I wish to show you that it took many thousands of years to prepare the mind of man for the reception of our revealed religion. The world was slowly but surely educated for the Christian belief and was long under the process of preparation for Inspired Religion.

It would take a course of lectures to put before you even a sketch of the history of religion. In my humble opinion the complete history of religion would be almost the same thing as a complete history of the human mind. Perhaps the first thought that man had after self-preservation, was that of religion. I have never met with any savage or barbarous race that had no religion. I have found the Esquimaux, the Negro, the Papuan, the South Sea Islanders, all deeply religious in their own way. True, we often call their religion superstition. But one has heard one sect of Christians say that of the religious service of another. I profess to be broad-minded in regard to religious belief, but like others I have had to draw the line somewhere. Indeed, during the best ten years of my life most of my time was given to obstruct men in the execution of the sacred duties imposed on them by their religion. I mean when they were, by the strict practice of their religious belief, bound to murder a neighbour to procure rest to the soul of a dead relative, or to preserve the honour of the tribe and family by squaring a blood account. Then in my last government I had, for example, to inflict punishment in at least two cases of human sacrifice. These sacrifices were carried out in conformity with a ghastly, a sickening and mysterious ritual. I can assure you that those poor people feel keenly the imperative nature of the duties imposed on them by their religion. With them the principle of an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth is not only a law, but a binding sacrament, a sacred duty.

In these things you can see the difference between a human religion and a divine, a revealed religion.

It follows from what I have said that the oldest races of whom we know anything had a religion of some kind. My remarks must be confined to the old races with whom the early Hebrews came into contact, or by whom they were influenced.

Let us begin with the most ancient race of men of whom we have any knowledge. Who were they, what were they, where did they live, what was their religious belief?

A glance at any map of the world will show you that by far the greatest land mass now above water on our globe is Asia. Indeed, Africa and Australasia are only detached parts of it. As we might therefore expect, all history, sacred and profane, declares that the human race first appeared in Asia, and to be precise, more or less in Central Asia. At what date the different ancient races of men appeared there, we have at present no means of knowing. Certain it is that the oldest race of whom we do know anything had left Central Asia and wandered westward, as far as Mesopotamia, before we first heard of them. This is the teaching of Genesis xi. 1 : 2, Coming from the rising of the sun

they found the plains of Shinar. Profane history teaches the same fact.

That oldest race we now call by the name of Sumerians. Now I would ask you to fix in your minds four periods of time, very easy to remember and appreciate. Some 1900 years will take you back to the Saviour on earth; a second 1900 years will take you from that to the time of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; a third 1900 years will take you from Abraham to the settlement of the Semitic races in the country about Mesopotamia; and a fourth 1900 years will take you back to the already long established Sumerian kingdoms in Mesopotamia, then in full development. This, you will observe, brings us back to some 7,600 years from now. From this it would appear that the Sumerian civilization was in existence 8,000 or 10,000 years ago, long before the advent of the Semitic races in Babylonia; or of the Egyptians, who clearly are not an aboriginal African race, on the banks of the Nile.

Now, please, do not let the dates I am speaking of disturb your minds in respect of the Book of Genesis. I, for my part, find no conflict between geology and history on the one hand and the Bible on the other. On that point I shall, therefore, only remind you that the Bible was never given us as a text book on geology or on geography. Nor, in my humble opinion, was the Bible ever meant to furnish us with a complete history of the world, or even of mankind. Unfortunately there is a want of intellectual flexibility in our northern natures, a deficiency in the power of appreciation of figurative language. In interpreting the Bible we bring to bear a superabundance of arid, barren logic, and dry, rigid realism, without a due sense of simile and metaphor, which are exuberant in the oriental mind.

For my own modest individual part, I am coming to regard the Bible as an introduction to the culminating event in our religion, the Life of Christ on Earth. The first part of the Old Testament leads up to the call of Abraham; the rest of that volume is a history of the Hebrews; the perfecting of our religion is related in the four Gospels. All that precedes them is only to prepare us for the redemption of mankind as there set forth.

The portion of the Bible that leads up to the call of Abraham is thus an introductory sketch to enable us to form an idea of the state of that part of the world at that time. I have said of that part of the world. It does not appear to me that we are intended to understand what is said there to apply to the whole world. Here we have an example of the rigid realism with which we are sometimes taught to approach the Bible. In Genesis iv. 14, Cain says: "Any one that finds me shall slay me." He went to the land of Nod, he married, and he built a city. In Genesis vi. 2:5 the sons of God took wives of the daughters of men; and there

were giants on the earth. This seems to shew that the Bible history refers here only to the part of the world with which the Hebrews were connected, and does not exclude the existence of other human beings on the earth at that time. Now, some of you may think that this is too narrow, or too broad, a view to take of the Bible. But just apply ordinary practice and experience to this question.

Any one that is in the habit of reading German newspapers and periodicals will tell you that German writers are constantly talking of their country as a "Weltmacht," a world-power; and of their "Weltpolitik," which means that their policy of state covers the world. In Luke ii, 1, we find that Cæsar Augustus issued a decree "to register the whole habitable world" (pasan ten oikoumenen). Now from that word "oikoumenen" we get our word oecumenic. You have read of many so-called oecumenic councils—councils representing, by title, the whole world, to deal with matters affecting the Christian religion.

In Daniel iv. 1, we find the King of Babylon issuing a proclamation "unto all people, nations and languages that dwell in all the earth."

Thothmes I. of Egypt says: "I have taken tribute from the nations of the north, from the nations of the south, as well as from those of the whole earth." And we say that the sun never sets on our Empire. Now we all know perfectly well that neither Emperor William, nor Augustus, nor Nebuchadnezzar, nor any oecumenical council, nor Pharoah, nor King Edward had relations, authority over, or representation for, the whole world, but speak only of those parts with which they were brought into contract. I only ask you to apply this to the first part of the Bible. If you do not do so, but regard the Bible as a secular encyclopedia of the whole world and of all mankind, then in my opinion, you abuse the Bible. Let me also in this connection remind you that the first part of the Bible is sometimes understood to refer to individuals when it is really speaking of whole races of men, or even of a city. This was pointed out by Augustine, a great student of the Bible, 1500 years ago.

It may be remarked here that Mesopotamia is a name as modern as the Greek language, meaning, as you know, the country between the rivers. We read of it also as Chaldea, Babylonia, and Assyria. A former name of that country was Sumer, or Shumir, whence the name Sumerian as applied to its oldest known inhabitants. Shumir is the "Shinar" or "Senaar" of Genesis ix. 2, that is: South Babylonia. Accad, was North Babylonia, and etymologically seems to mean "Highlands." But what the Sumerians called themselves we do not know. They arrived from the East, through the mountain passes of Media, in

the swamps and marshes of Mesopotamia, which had been formed by slow reclamation from the sea by the deposits brought down by the Euphrates and Tigris. Here the Sumerians settled down and commenced a life of laborious toil. They dug canals, they dried the swamps, they regulated the rivers, they cultivated the soil; their tents were followed by mudhouses, and to these succeeded sun-dried, and fire-burned bricks, cemented together in solid walls by molten bitumen. Under the blight of the Turk and his strange and backward religion, Mesopotamia is now a land of arid sand and pestiferous swamps. Under the hands of the Sumerians Mesopotamia was, seven or eight thousand years ago, the most fruitful place on the earth.

Now I must tell you how we come to know anything about these Sumerians. Our knowledge comes now at first hand from translating a certain part of the library of Sardanapalus, (668-626 B.C.), erroneously spoken of as the last King of Assyria, on whom you may remember was formerly said in our histories, on the authority of Ctesias, to have burned himself with his wives and treasures when the Medes and Persians took Nineveh. But all that account of him was incorrect. He died as he lived—a great King—in 625 or 626 B.C. “Nineveh, which Sardanapalus had made the capital of Assyria in 666 B.C., fell in 608, taken by the Medes, under King Cyaxares, assisted by the King of Babylon, probably the father of Nebuchadnezzar. The records of Sardanapalus are written on clay tiles. They contain an account of the Sumerians, composed by the Chaldean priests, line by line in the Sumerian and Semitic languages, in the cuneiform character, written about 2000 B.C., about the time of Abraham. The Sumerian tongue had already nearly died out, and hence the priests had to translate it into the Semitic language to preserve it on record. The Sumerians, like the Mexicans on the arrival of Cortes, wrote at first by sketches or pictures, apparently on some vegetable substance. With this picture-writing you are familiar in the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, who used this form of writing at a much later date. The example of pictures instead of what we call writing—which etymologically means scratching—is best known to you in the picture-bibles used in Europe for people that could not read. The Sumerians next used clay tiles, instead of paper, parchment, or any other substitute, probably in order to obtain permanent records. Writing on stone, which was certainly carried to great perfection under Hammurabi, and which we still practice, would have been difficult in South Mesopotamia owing to the absence of stone. It soon became convenient in practice to convert the outline of pictures into straight lines in different combinations, which may have been stamped, and not scratched, into the soft clay, so that the original picture

lost its form and was represented by a number of wedge-shaped lines variously arranged to express or denote different things and different sounds. For example, the Sumerians used in picture-writing an eight-rayed star to represent Heaven. The heaven was by them called "An." The eight-rayed star was used also to represent the syllable "An" in composition, in spelling words. The eight-rayed star then became four crossed cuneiform lines; and these lines permanently spelt "An," either when it meant heaven, or "an" as a syllable in composition. All the Sumerian records prior to the time of Abraham were written in the old Sumerian language, which bears no affinity whatever to any other known tongue, Chinese, Hebrew, and all Semitic and Egyptian languages being modern compared to the old, pure Sumerian, by thousands of years the oldest of all known tongues, and in all probability the first ever represented in writing of any kind. It may be that this total diversity of language between the Sumerians and the invading Semitic races has some connection with the confusion of tongues of Babel. Even the invading hordes of Semites did not at first understand each others language.

Up to 1802 the most grotesque ideas were held as to the cuneiform writing. It was generally thought to be mere ornament. In that year a teacher in a Germann gymnasium, Grotefend, discovered in the cuneiform records of the old Persian Kings the groups of wedge-shaped lines that spelt the names Hystaspes, Darius, and Xerxes, and the words "King of Kings." This, by using Persian inscriptions, has been the key to unlock the secrets contained in the old languages that are written in the cuneiform characters, used all over Asia Minor, first invented and used, so far as we know, by the Sumerians. Now as to Sumerian politics—

In the earliest times, apparently some nine or ten thousand years ago, the Sumerians, after draining and cultivating Mesopotamia, formed two states or cities, Kisch, in the north, and Schirburla, on the Schatt-el-haj canal, (Telloh), in the south. They lived in continuous enmity, alternately conquering each other. So true is it that man is and always has been a quarrelsome, fighting animal.

Under King Meselim, Kisch at one time had subdued Schirburla, and a small new state with Gischu as its capital had formed under the protection of Kisch. Gischu soon tried to enlarge its territory at the cost of Schirburla. The reigning dynasty of Schirburla, called Ur-Nina from its founder, then obtained the mastery, and subduing Kisch, Gischu, and Elam of the Bible, Genesis xiv., 1, founded a great kingdom. Ennea-tum, the grandson of Ur-nina, allowed too much independence to Gischu. They threw down his statue at the boundary where it had been set up as a

mark, destroyed the sanctuaries of the gods of Schirburla, at the frontier, and pressed hard on Schirburla, during two reigns. The son of Ennea-tum, Entemena, restored the fortunes of Schirburla, completely subdued Gischu and put a priest there to govern it. He cut more canals in Schirburla and prepared much more land for tillage. It was he that dug the canal Schatt-el-haj, which still joins the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. Later on Gischu got the upper hand over Schirburla and extended her power over all south Babylonia, under a king called Lugalzaggisi. At this point we are now brought into touch with cities that survived into the earliest Bible times. Lugalzaggisi made the city of Erech the capital of his kingdom. From Erech Lugalzaggisi extended his kingdom in all directions, so that he was able to say of himself: "From the lower sea along the Euphrates and Tigris as far as the upper sea (meaning the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean), Enlil, (his God), led my way; from the rising of the sun till his going down put the rule in my hand." The same Lugalzaggisi gave special attention to another town now of great interest to us, namely, to Ur, long ages later in the hands of the Semitic Chaldeans, and the native town of Abraham. But Lugalzaggisi's great state did not endure, and was later on reduced to Erech and Ur by the arrival of the Shemites. The Septuagint says, Genesis x., 10: "And the beginning of his kingdom (that is Nebrod or Nimrod) was Babylon, and Orech, and Archad, and Chalanne in the land of Senaar." The inscriptions of Ur, which became the capital of a new kingdom not of great extent, speak of only two towns, Ur and Erech. This Erech, in the Septuagint Orech, is known now as "Warka." Round it was the general necropolis of Babylonia, and from beyond it even. This peculiar idea of sacred burying ground in Mesopotamia is far from extinct to-day. Corpses are brought from great distances to be buried there. Erech, or Orech, is probably the work of the Sumerians.

Long centuries after these events and after the Shemites had begun to invade the land of the Sumerians, the old Schirburla regained ascendancy, so that its King Gudea, about 3,000 B. C., was also able to boast in his numerous inscriptions how he had brought material from North and West Arabia, and from the Amanus range to adorn his capital. Like Lugalzaggisi of Erech, he boasted how "Ningirsu, his beloved god, has, from the upper sea to the lower sea, cleared his path." It was this Gudea that prepared for his temples the magnificent Sumerian works of art, discovered by the French Consul, Ernest de Sarzec, at Telloh, in the ruins of Schirburla, and now to be seen in the Louvre at Paris. Schirburla, soon after the reign of Gudea, became eclipsed by Ur, and for ever. Ur, under the kings Ur-Engur, Dungi, and

their successors, then became, as mentioned above, the centre of an important kingdom. Ur was then at the mouth of the Euphrates, a maritime commercial town, but its ruins are now 150 miles from the sea. We have seen that it first came under notice in the time of Lugalzaggisi, of Gischu. Ur is first mentioned in our Bible, and in the German Bible, in Genesis xi., 28. But the Septuagint says that Arrhan died in the country of the Chaldeans, and does not give the name Ur.

But what we are most concerned about here, to-night, is the Religion of the Sumerians and pre-biblical people. You know that all great religions have originated in Asia. This is equally true of the Sumerian religion, by far the oldest and earliest we have heard of. On this account it is of intense interest to us; but this interest is more than doubled when we remember that the Sumerians were the first inhabitants of that place where Abraham, and his father before him, was born and educated. The religion of which I am going to talk to you was practised at Ur thousands of years before Abraham. They began, as we do, with the origin of things.

The following is the bilingual translation of the Sumerian account of the creation of the world made by the Chaldean priests, as mentioned above, some 4,000 years ago:

"As yet was the pure domicile, the domicile of the gods on earth, not made;

Not yet one reed sprouted, not yet a tree created;

No brick yet fashioned, no tile yet formed;

No house yet made, no city yet built;

No town yet made, no earthly habitation yet reared;

Nippur was not yet made; the temple of Bel, Igurra,* not yet built;

Erech was not yet made; the temple of Istar, I-Anna, not yet built;

The ocean not yet made; NUN-KI (the abode of the god, Ea), not yet built;

Even the pure domicile, the house of the gods, its site was not yet made, the whole of the Lands and the Sea;

Then the waters were moved, and in those days was NUN-KI (the site of the earthly paradise) made;

The temple of I-sag-illa was built where in heaven's ocean the god Anu, King of the abode of glory and purity, dwells;

Babel, the gate of God, was made; and the temple, I-sag-illa, completed.

The Angels of heaven's ocean had he made all at once.

* Explored by the Americans, Harper and Helprecht; chief temple was Igurra, dedicated to Inlilla or Bel.

Sirgulla, the seat of the delight of their heart, called they glorious;

The god Gi-lamma set bounds before the waters; he created the earth, and he raised it up along with the boundary before the waters;

And when the gods were installed at the place of their heart's delight, then formed he the human race.

The goddess Aruru, the source of humanity, created he at the same time.

The animal of the god Girra, the living creatures of the field, created he.

The River Tigris, the River Euphrates, created he, and appointed them their places, and he called them good.

Grass and herb, reed and wood, created he; the verdure of the fields created he; the lands, swamps, and clumps of reeds also, wild oxen, young asses, the ewe with her young, the lambs of the fold, gardens and hedges also. The antelope-buck took his place with him. The lord, the god Gi-lamma, built up a terrace by the sea, like to which nothing of the kind had ever before been made by him. Trees created he; he himself created tiled buildings, a city made he; a dwelling-place created he; the temple Igurra, the temple of Bel; and I-anna, the temple of Istar."

These geographical names take us back at least 6,000 years, to a time prior to Ur and Archad. The places mentioned here are evidently all holy cities.

It is not certain that this Babel is the same as Babylon, or that the Babylon of Nimrod is the same city as the later Babylon of Sargon and Nebuchadnezzar. The Septuagint uses the name Babylon in Genesis x., 10; but it does not, like our Bible, use the word Babel in Genesis ix, 9, but instead of it the word "Confusion." Some think that the first certain reference to Babylon in the Bible is in 2 Kings xx, 12, when Berodach-Baladan, King of Babylon, sent presents and a letter to Hezekiah.

From the early Sumerians, and up to Genesis, the starting point in Creation is Chaos. A waste of earth and water—as Shumir or Sumer then was, for such indeed was the physical condition of Mesopotamia when the Sumerians first arrived there. From this world of Chaos proceeded the great original and supreme god of the heavens, ANU, with a following of lower evil spirits, like the Shamas of the Altaic folks. Anu had a daughter named B'au (the Bohu of the Phenicians and Hebrews). She, B'au, was the goddess of chaos, and specially personified and represented the waters above the firmament, in other words, rain, to fertilize the earth. Then probably with the reclamation of the swamps of Mesopotamia, came the great earth god, Ea, who also was the god of the waters under the earth, called in

inscriptions "Lord of Earth and Water," "King of the depths" "the Ram (Alimma) of the waters," "the good god, Dugga." Ea had later a daughter associated with him, Ghanna or Chavvu, our Chaos. She represented the water depths under the firmament. Chaos was regarded with friendly feelings by the Sumerians, contrary to the ideas of the North Babylonians, and the Hebrews. The most ancient cosmogony therefore gives us, above the firmament, ANU, "Heaven," and B'AU, his daughter, the water above the firmament; below the firmament, EA, the god of the earth, and his daughter Ghanna, the water depths below. B'au became, as daughter of Heaven, "Itar," representing originally heaven's ocean, and the idea of rain, or the waters above the firmament; then at a later period she became the goddess of love, Astarte the special goddess of Nineveh, in Hebrew Astaroth, then the morning and evening star, Venus of the Romans, and the Aphrodite of the Greeks. (The western Shemites later confused her with Chaos). The old Sumerian word for waters was "NUN," and it was applied to them before the firmament dividing them and the earth arose, when the aboriginal waters of Chaos were one. All original religious ideas were thus grouped round these aboriginal waters. The goddess of Heaven was sometimes called "Annuit"; the angels were "Annuna-Ki"; and the most ancient settlement of South Babylonia, the seat of the worship of the god Ea, the earthly paradise, was called "Nunki," that is the place of Nun, the seat of the original waters. It was called also Eru-Dugga, the city of the good Ea, and later Eridu.

The idea connected with the original waters of Chaos, the "Nun" of the Sumerians, corresponds with Genesis i, 2. We see from the above that Giri-lamma created the firmament and separated the waters as is done in Genesis i, 6-8. I have never found it easy to quite grasp the word "firmament" in our Bible. It seems to be simply a translation of the "Stereōma" of the Septuagint, which signifies something firm, strong, solid. It does not appear that our word firmament is happily used to represent the gaseous space between the waters of heaven and the waters of the earth. Unfortunately the Chaldean word used, "Annu," and the Sumerian word "Gidir," are as obscure as our "firmament," or as the Septuagint "Stereōma."

Although Ea was thus the good god of the Sumerians he did not directly confer his benefits on man, but through the most interesting person in the godhead of the Sumerians, his son, Girri-Dugga, called also "Girri-Alimma" or "Gi-lamma" which seems to mean the Hero or Herald of Ea. A later form of the name was Mirri-Dugga, so that the North Shemitic Babylonians identified him with the Sun god Amaru-duk, the Merodach of the Bible, and the Marduk by whom oaths to be binding were taken

under Hammurabis' Code. Nothing can be more interesting to us than the position and character of the "Gi-lamm," the good son of the great god of the earth, the third person in the Sumerian trinity. The part played by the son of Ea is illustrated well in a dialogue reported in an incantation formula which frequently occurs in the old Sumerian, which runs as follows, according to the German of Professor Hommel—"Girri-Dugga has looked on the misery of afflicted mankind; he approached his father in his abode and says: My father, the folly (delirium) came from the nether-world. And a second time he says to him—"What shall man do? He knows not how he can obtain healing salvation." Ea answered his son, Girri-Dugga: "My son, what is there thou dost not know already, what more shall I add for thee? What I know, that knowest thou also. Go my son, Girri-Dugga, take a vessel and bring therein some water at the mouth of the streams, and on this water bestow thy pure blessing and besprinkle therewith this man, the child of his god." Then the magic priest takes up the exorcism thus, addressing himself to man: "May the folly of his brain dissolve; the sickness in his head, which enchants him like a nightly ghost, may it depart; may the word of Ea drive it out: the goddess Dungal-Nunna restore thee, may the fair form of Girra-Dugga's first-born, son of the abyss of waters, be thine."

The intervention of the son of the great god Ea was invoked against all diseases and misfortunes, even to procure cloudless moons. Thus we find that the mind of man was directed towards the idea of an intercessor between the supreme god and man, who was suffering, and lost, if salvation could not be obtained. The intercessor was thus, thousands of years before Abraham, held to be the son of the supreme god. In all this we have, in my humble opinion, a sublime lesson. We may see in it, if we will only think, the gradual preparation of the human race for an inspired religion. We may see man, the most ancient race of men of whom we know anything, feeling his way in the dark towards the faint and still distant first glimpse of light.

We now come to speak of the next great race from Asia that settled in Mesopotamia, the then garden of the world.

THE SHEMITES OR SEMITES.

Frequent mention has already been made of the invasion of Mesopotamia by Semite races. They, like the Sumerians, arrived from the desert and the east. They were brave, war-like and rude, compared to the Sumerians, who had, by this time, suffered from the effeminacy that is an inevitable result of comfort and prosperity. The early history of these Shemite hordes

we owe to Nabunaïd, the last King of Babylon (556 to 538 B.C.) This Nabunaïd, though apparently of the royal line, really usurped the throne. His father was a chief priest. He became king in 556 B.C. His reign was very important, perhaps next in importance to that of Nebuchadnezzar. It would appear that Nabunaïd was so interested in preserving the ancient religion, and in rebuilding and restoring the old temples, that he made over the regency of his kingdom to his son Belshazzar, in order that he himself might devote his time and attention exclusively to that pious work.

You will remember that in the Book of Daniel the last King of Babylon is called Belshazzar, and that he was the son of Nebuchadnezzar, who (Daniel iv., 37) is represented as a very religious man. Belshazzar was the son (Daniel ii., 2) of Nebuchadnezzar in the sense that Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii., 3) was the son of David, that is, he was a descendent. It was this Belshazzar that had the fateful warning in writing on the wall. The name means "Bel, save the king." He was the commander-in-chief in the war against Cyrus, and was defeated 538 B. C. by the Persians when Babylon fell. Herodotus, I., 141, seems to allude to this banquet of Belshazzar. The word that is translated, king, by us, could properly be translated regent, so that there is really no necessary contradiction between the two accounts as regards Nabunaïd, who was, *de jure*, the last king. Nabunaïd died three months after the capture of Babylon by Cyrus.

Nabunaïd, probably about 545 B.C., when on an archæological expedition to Sippar, a town of northern Babylonia, found deep in the foundation of the temple of the Semitic sun-god, Shamash, the record of its founding by the very ancient Babylonian ruler Naram-Sin, son of Sargon. King Nabunaïd has related thus, with deep reverence, his discovery:—"When I had made them dig eighteen feet deep, there Shamash, the great god of Ebarra, which temple is the delight of his heart, showed me the record of its founding by Naram-Sin, the son of Sargon, a record which none of my ancestors had looked upon for 3,200 years." On the authority, therefore, of Nabunaïd, who in all probability had complete genealogical records, the Semite Naram-Sin ruled about 3,750 B.C., or say 1,600 or 1,700 years before Abraham. Nabunaïd, it will be noticed, says that Naram-Sin was the son of Sargon. Now, we have a short autobiography of Sargon, the great leader of the invading Shemites, which was placed in the library of Sardanapalus at Nineveh, about 650 B. C. He says:—"I am Sargon, the mighty king, the King of Agade. My mother was poor; my father I knew not; a brother of my father dwelt in the hills. My native town is Azupiranu, situated on the Euphrates,

My poor mother conceived me and bore me in secret; she laid me in a little box of reeds and plastered it over with asphalt. She put me on the river, and the river carried me to Akki, the water-bearer. Akki, the water-bearer, drew me from the river; Akki, the water-bearer, brought me up as a boy; Akki, the water-bearer, made me a gardener. While I was a gardener I became dear to the goddess Istar, and I became king."

The Agade here mentioned by Sargon as his capital is no other than the city of Archad of Genesis x., 10, then spoken of as being of the kingdom of Nimrod, while Babylon, Orech, and Chalanne were in Shinar. Agade was on the Euphrates, close to a canal which divided it from the town of Sippar. The two cities are spoken of together in the Bible as Sepharvaim.

From this history, which reminds us vividly of the infancy of Moses, it was thought at first that this Sargon was mythical, and that the stories of his conquests in Elam, Arabia, and the West, were pure inventions; but apart from the discovery of his autobiography, the existence of business records connected with his campaigns show clearly that he certainly existed. Tiles are dated, for example, from the year in which Sargon made an expedition against Elam and Zachara, and from other campaigns by him. Naram-Sin succeeded his father Sargon, and founded the temple at Sippar that was excavated by Nabunaid. Naram-Sin was worshipped during his life time by his subjects as the "god of Agade." Probably the earliest records of divine honours being paid to a man are those that refer to Sargon and Naram-Sin. Babylon is first mentioned in the reign of Sargon, probably thus about 3,800 B.C. The story of the foundation of Babylon by Sumerians, as related by the Greek, Ctesias, is purely mythical. Its proper name was Bab-Ilo, or "The gate of the god Ilo." The Semites of Sargon made their language prevail over the Sumerian, though they adopted the civilisation of the latter. Other Semitic invasions followed that of Sargon, and the Sumerian language and the Sumerian nations lost their nationality; so that the Semitic languages of Sargon and Hammurabi, of whom we shall speak later, are the same.

The Semites established themselves first in the north of Babylonia. By 2,300 B. C., Elam, of the Old Testament, which lay S. E. of the Babylonian plains, from which it had no natural boundary, and with which it had before this been in strife, overran and conquered South Babylonia. In Genesis x., 22, Elam and Assour, that is, the Elamites and Assyrians, are sons of Shem. The Semitic Elamites violated the temples, and their king, Kudur-Nanchundi, in 2,235 B. C., carried off the sacred image of the Chaldean goddess of the Earth, Nana, from the biblical Erech to Susa, their capital, whence it was recovered

after a lapse of 1,635 years by Sardanapalus. The Elamites, however, left the land to be ruled by subject princes. The capital of the southern part of Babylonia then was Larsa, the Ellasar of the Bible (Genesis xiv., 1), of which Arioch was king in the time of Abraham. Babylon came to great eminence at the same time in the north, but under a new Semitic dynasty, at first dependant on Elam. The names of the early kings of Babylon are all Semitic; but they are of a different tribe from that of Sargon, being more recent arrivals. They required interpreters between them and the earlier Semites of Sargon's invasion; but they adopted the language of the latter and became incorporated with them. The sixth ruler of this Semitic dynasty of Babylon was the celebrated Hammurabi, one of the greatest generals and statesmen the world has seen. It is supposed, but not absolutely proved, that he is the Amraphel, or Amarphal, King of Senaar, of Genesis xiv., 1. Hammurabi was a contemporary of Eri-Aku, King of Larsa, whose name is also written differently in the Bible as "Arioch of Ellasar," (Genesis xiv., 1), a contemporary of Amraphel. Hammurabi, it would appear from Genesis xiv., 1-16, was, at first, like all other neighbouring kings, in some degree feudatory to Chedarlaomer, King of Elam, that is, at the time of the Battle of Five Kings against Four. This relation between the Kings of Elam and Shinar did not last long. About the year 2,250 B. C., Hammurabi conquered Larsa, the capital of the King Eri-Aku, who then owed allegiance to Elam. By this conquest Hammurabi united north and south Babylonia. Babylon, which was already Hammurabi's own capital, thus became for the first time the chief city of all Babylonia, a position she maintained 1,172 years, sometimes in rivalry with Nineveh, till she succumbed in 538 B.C. to the Indo-Germanic Persians. The position of Babylon was chiefly maintained through those long centuries, owing to the extraordinary enlightenment of the code of laws which Hammurabi prepared and promulgated. These are beautifully cut in a column of balsalt, or fine grained black diorite, in the cuneiform character. This column was discovered lately at Susa, to which place it had been carried after the capture of Babylon. It may be seen by any of you in the Louvre at Paris, where I examined it two years ago. Last year I translated every word of that code from the then newly issued Italian edition of it, a code that had been published while Abraham was still living in his tent. In many points it resembles the laws of Moses.

We now come to the religion of the Shemitic races of Mesopotamia, brought with them from their own country, but soon influenced by the religion of the Sumerians, which they eventually submerged.

The account of the Creation by the Shemitic North Babylonians began as follows:—

“At the time when up above the heaven was not yet named, and when the plain below yet bore no name, then the waters of heaven, the old original beginning, their parent; and also chaos, abyss-foundation, the mother of them all; they swirled and eddied with their billows in one, when as yet no stalk of corn had been cut down; as yet not a single reed sprung up; at the time when none of the gods were yet created, no name yet given, no destiny yet fixed, then were the gods of Chaos created, they, the evil spirits of Lachum and Lachâmu, were brought forth, till they grew up. The host of heaven and the host of earth were created. Long, long were the days; the gods Anu, Bel, and Ea were created.”

It will be noted that here we have a trinity of gods, the same trinity as the Sumerians, one of the three a son. The account then goes on to say that when the gods had been created they directed Bel, or Merodach (the Semitic sun god of North Babylonia), to proceed to combat with Ti-âmat, the ancient water of chaos, with her monsters, because they had rebelled against the gods above, and had to be conquered or humbled to prevent universal ruin. Then this combat is beautifully described, and when “the dragon of the sea,” Ti-âmat, has been overcome, the work of creation is proceeded with as follows: “Then Bel Merodach cleft Ti-âmat in twain; without pity, like a figure of clay, half of her he took and with an arch he roofed it over, pushed a bar in front thereof, and placed a guard thereby, and commanded the waters that they should not burst forth. Then traversed Merodach the heavens and looked down upon the regions below, and came towards the ancient waters, the dwelling of the god Ea. And the lord measured the greatness of the ancient waters, and the exalted one built like to the ancient waters (the temple of) Ischirra; yea, the exalted one built Ischirra, which he constructed as the vault of heaven, at the time he settled Anu, Bel and Ea, even there in their abodes.” (That means as constellations).

The most interesting member of the trinity in this account also is the god Merodach, or Bel.

We have seen that the actual creator, according to earliest Sumerians, was Gi-lamma, called also Girra-Dugga, and the later Dugga, son of the great and beneficent Earth god EA. When the Shemites arrived in Mesopotamia they brought with them Shamash, the sun god. It appears they, to a large extent, adopted both the civilization and religious ideas of the much more enlightened Sumerians. Mirri-Dugga was thus gradually converted into Marduk—the Merodach—of the Hebrews; and to

Marduk was thus ascribed the work of creation, an idea evidently borrowed from the Sumerians, but modified by the introduction of a great combat to suit the more warlike spirits of the fighting and conquering Shemites.

Marduk became the supreme god at Babylon. He was often called Bel-Merodach, or the Lord Marduk. You may remember that Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, was succeeded by his son, "Evil-Merodach," in 561 B.C. Efforts were made at one time to give to the god Marduk a sort of Monotheistic position. It is of much interest to find that in judicial proceedings under the great code of laws of Hammurabi, published about 2,250 B.C., the oath imposed in court on witnesses, claimants, &c., was always in the name of Marduk. But in the earlier days of the Babylonian Shemites, Marduk had the attributes of an intercessor between man and his father EA, just as had Mirri-Dugga with the Sumerians.

The Shemite account of the creation in cuneiform inscriptions is supported by fragments that remain of a history of Babylonia written in Greek about 250 B. C. by Berôsus, a priest of Belus in Babylon. Berôsus says the materials for his work were derived from the records of the temple of Belus. He writes: "Then came Bel (Merodach) and cleft the woman monster (TI-ÂMAT the representative or personification of the ancient floods of Chaos) in two; from one half thereof made he the earth, from the other the heavens, and extinguished her existence."

In this connection it is also of deep interest to find that the most ancient Egyptians brought with them to Egypt old Babylonian architecture and religion. The earliest Egyptians had also in their account of the creation, according to Erman, the floods of Chaos, bearing the ancient Sumerian name of NUN. We find in the Egyptian Book of the Dead this sentence: "On the dark ocean of the god Nun in the earliest age of time the Sun-god Ra appeared and took over the government of the world." According to another ancient legend of Egypt, Ra, when man had rebelled against him, went to the god Nun and addressed him with the words: "O, thou eldest of the gods, from whom I sprung, and ye ancestral spirits, behold man, who has sprung from my eye, how he deviseth evil in spite of me." Here, therefore, we find the son of the supreme god performing the work of creation; and we see the son similarly consulting the father with respect to man. Just as the Shemitic North Babylonians assimilated their solar god Merodach to the Sumerian Mirri-Dugga, so did the ancient Egyptians assimilate also their solar god Ra to Mirri-Dugga. But Ra, differing from the peaceful Sumerian Mirra-Dugga, and resembling the warlike Shemitic Merodach, fought and slew the monster Chaos, as we

learn from an execration of the time of Amenophis III. of Egypt, about 1,440 B.C. : "Thou shalt be annihilated like to the accursed serpent Apophis at the dawn of the creation, and shall sink like a stone in the great flood." Also, according to Duemichen, the oldest Egyptian texts often speak of the raising of the firmament, and the separation of the land from the water. Very noteworthy is it that the most ancient Sumerian legend corresponds more nearly to Genesis than do the later Semitic and Egyptian accounts. Remember in this connection that Ur was a city of the most ancient Sumerians; and that long ages later it was the city where Abraham was brought up.

With the Sumerians the first part of the creation is the preparation of the dwellings of the gods; with the Assyrian Babylonians, and the Egyptians, the great combat with Chaos: in the Bible the creation of light. Then in all four comes the Firmament in the same order of events.

According to the most ancient views of the Semitic peoples, and of the ancient Egyptians who were their relatives, the sun under the name of Shamash, and Ra, respectively, was the reflection of the highest godhead, and thus the creator of the world was held by them to be personified in the sun. But with the Sumerians it is the Gi-lamma, Mirri-Dugga, the first born of the benign and gracious spirit of the Earth and of the Waters under the earth, that creates mankind and his abodes, and protects them as his wards henceforth from the bane influences of the evil spirits.

Mirra-Dugga the son of the supreme god Ea, creates the world and saves it, and does so without any combat, as peacefully as the creation in Genesis; whereas Ra and Merodach proceed to the creation of the world after an awful combat. But through the three ancient religions there runs the sublime idea of the Son of the Supreme God as intercessor between the Father and man. This subject of the search after a Supreme godhead leads us to briefly consider,

MONOTHEISM.

Few questions can be of so great interest to us as is that of the idea of one Supreme God. It cannot but be apparent to everyone of us that the first thinking man must have observed that there is a harmony running through the natural world that is presented to our senses which clearly indicates one plan, one design, one architect, one builder. Times and seasons, the hosts of heaven, and the hosts of the earth, all form parts of one indivisible whole that point clearly to one Supreme Creator. Do not for a moment suppose that these things have ever in any part of the world escaped the savage mind. Aboriginal people

are closer observers of nature and natural phenomena than we are. I have never yet met with a savage or barbarous race that did not, for example, have names for certain groups of stars, and for the great planets.

Some of the native tribes of Australia, which we used to be told were the lowest and most ignorant savages in the world, call the pleiades the corroboree of young girls; the southern cross, a duck; and Orion, a hunter throwing a boomerang at the duck.

The Fijians plant their yams when the erythrea tree blooms; and they can tell to an hour when the two shoals of the Balalo will arrive each year on the reefs of the sea. To the ancient Chaldeans we owe the earliest studies in astronomy, and our method of reckoning by the half dozen; they found out by direct observation how to calculate the eclipses of the moon. It was thus inevitable that men should always have recognized that heaven and earth, the whole universe, is the work of one great power.

We have seen that the most ancient of men known to us, the Sumerians, began with one original god, Anu, whom they placed in heaven above. The Babylonian Semites brought their great sun-god, Shamas, with them. Brought into contact with Mirri-Dugga, son of the Sumerian God of the Earth, Ea, the Babylonians converted their Shamas into the Merodach of the Bible, and came very near at one period to making him a one and only supreme god before, long before, the days of Abraham.

On the point of one supreme god, however, the ancient Egyptians came perhaps nearer to the light than any other nation that lived and thought in darkness. For the common people the Egyptian teachers had hundreds and hundreds of gods, represented by animals and images. But the priests and the educated Egyptians had a god of their own of a totally different type. The Egyptian sacred texts, known only to the priests, taught them such wonderful maxims as these: "There is a single Being, the sole producer of all things both in Heaven and earth, himself not produced of anything; the only true living god, self originated, who exists from the beginning; who has made all things, but has not himself been made; his commencement is from the beginning, he is the god that has existed from all time; there is no god without him; no mother bore him, no father had begotten him, he is a god-goddess created from himself; all gods came into existence when he began."

This god the Egyptians never represented by any image. Apparently his name was never called in vain, so sacred was it. We do not even yet know what his name was.

In Genesis xli., 38, Pharaoh, as if he believed in one supreme and only God, says of Joseph: "Shall we find such a man as this, who has the spirit of God in him." It is believed that this was said by King Apepi, the last Pharaoh of the line of the Hyksös or Shepherd Kings of Egypt, about 1,600 B. C. The Hyksös Kings had their capital in lower Egypt, near the Pelusic mouth of the Nile, and thus not far from the land of Goshen. Apepi tried to turn the Egyptians from all worship except that of one god, called SET. It was, of course, possible for him to have regarded SET as being the same as the one God of Joseph, though under a different name. In quite a recent number of *La Nuova Antologia*, President Breasted, of Chicago, is made to say that he has found that the Christian dogma of the fraternity of God and of his infinite goodness was taught in Egypt by and under the King Amenophis IV. Now this Pharaoh was one of the last of the eighteenth dynasty, say, roughly, about half way between the Pharaoh of Joseph and the Pharaoh of Moses. It was, of course, known long ago that this Amenophis had tried to give some sort of unique position to his god ATEN or RA, under what is known as the "disc worship." But it was supposed that this was only a form of solar worship. Now, it would appear from the statement imputed to the Chicago savant, that this Pharaoh was really looking at the distant early dawn of inspired and revealed religion, the light of which was, however, not vouchsafed to his generation.

There are many examples in Genesis that seem to shew that the one true God was known to not a few others besides Abraham. At the same time idolatry was not quite unknown even to the favourite wife of Jacob. These questions, however, must be left for the present. Enough has been said to show that for thousands of years men saw some dawning of a one and Supreme God before the light of revealed religion burst forth into brilliant day, and before the world had been prepared for it.

A FEW WORDS ON THE LATEST DISCOVERY IN EGYPT.

At the present time there are three great Egyptologists, Schiaparelli, an Italian; Masperö, Curator of the Museum at Cairo; and Naville, head of the Egyptian Exploration Fund. This Fund it was that worked out the route of the Exodus of the Hebrews, and also discovered Pithom, supposed to be one of the store cities built by Joseph when Prime Minister to Apepi, King of Egypt, for the purpose of accumulating supplies of corn. Quite lately the officers of the Egyptian Exploration Fund made an interesting discovery at Thebes, on the Nile.

Thebes, where this new discovery has been made, was the capital of Egypt during the 18th dynasty. It is called No-Ammon in the Bible. It was in upper Egypt, on both sides of the Nile. The portion of the town that stood on the left bank of the river was called Pathyris, as being under the protection of Athor.

Athor, or Hathor, was the goddess of Joy. She was the incarnation of the cow that brought forth and nursed the sun; she was also the goddess of the dead, and provided them with bread and water as they left this world. She was early confused with Isis. The third Egyptian month "Athyr" was named after her. In Thebes she was the goddess of the city of the dead, where the royal necropolis was situated, and immense graveyards—five miles long—of man, and of all animals except the horse and the ass. It was there that in recent years men found the mummy of Ramses II, the oppressor of the Hebrews, and the father of Thermuthis, the King's daughter that found Moses.

Ramses II. is the Pharaoh of Exodus I, 8, who knew not Joseph. Indeed he belonged to a different race from Apepi, the Hyksös King of Joseph. Some years ago a fellah found the mummies of Set, of Ramses II, who was his son, and of Menephthah, the Pharaoh that let the Hebrews depart. This fellah concealed his discovery and took from the jewelry hidden with these mummies, which had been removed from the necropolis to escape robbers, a few articles now and then for sale. He revealed this to his sons [on his deathbed. They quarrelled, and one informed the authorities, with the result that Menephthah with his father and grandfather may now be seen by any Hebrew at the museum in Cairo.

Athor, the goddess of Thebes, was represented in the form of a cow, or of a woman with a cow's head, having horns with the sun between them.

Now a cow representing Hathor was found some years ago and is to be seen in the Museum at Turin. But the Hathor just discovered was in position in her shrine, surrounded by all that her worship required. This is quite unique. The new cow, cut in stone, is life size, covered with gold gilt and paint, and was dedicated by Amenhetep or Amenophus II, the son of Thoutmosis III. Thoutmosis III treated the Hebrews well. We are indebted to him for the obelisks that now adorn New York Central Park, and the Thames Embankment, known as Cleopatra's needles. Now it is very interesting and instructive from a religious point of view to notice:—

(1) That this newly discovered cow, this new representative of Athor, was dedicated by the King of Egypt at a time when the Hebrews were still well treated, and Joseph not forgotten.

(2) That it is highly probable that there were Hebrews present at the dedication. We know from Exodus iii, 16, that the Hebrews had a representative senate. But whether they were present or not at the dedication, it seems certain that the Hebrews were quite familiar with this particular idol and her worship.

(3) That the newly discovered cow was gold gilt. Now apply all this to Exodus xxxii. The Hebrews, thinking they were deserted by Moses, there caused Aaron, their priest, to prepare them a golden calf to represent the gods that had brought them out of Egypt. This was quite a natural thing for them to do if they were to abandon the worship of the god of Abraham. Their fathers were pastoralists; they were familiar with the worship of Athor, represented in idol form by this newly discovered cow. Athor was one of the great deities of Egypt and they knew very well that the Egyptians that worshipped Athor were a mighty nation. We have seen already how the ancient kings ascribed their fortune to their God. This is not an excuse for the Hebrews, but it is an explanation of their peculiar form of idolatry at that particular time. It further shews us how one has often to seek in the bye-ways of knowledge for the information that illustrates events related in our Bible.

Chapter XXI. of Numbers is also interesting from a point of view more or less related to the worship of the golden calf. The Hebrews were bit according to our version by "fiery" serpents. "Fiery" refers presumably to the colour of the serpent. It was in all probability the *Cerastes* or horned viper, a common snake in the sandy parts of tropical Africa. It is common enough in West Africa. It is of a brownish-yellowish-mottled colour. Its bite is very deadly. The Septuagint Bible does not use a word corresponding to "fiery," but says the people were bit by "deadly snakes." And Moses was commanded to make a serpent of copper or bronze—not a "fiery" serpent—and to put it on a pole for the people to look at. It could not have been made of brass, which was then unknown. Now the worship of snakes, called Ophiolatry, has been distributed probably almost over every country where deadly snakes are met with. In India at the present day snakes are in certain parts sacred, and are carefully preserved and tended. The snake was worshipped by the North American Indians. There are tribes in New Guinea that I could not induce to kill a snake. If a serpent crawls into a village there the people make it offerings to induce it to retire. I have found it constantly represented in carvings by all the tropical aborigines I have known. The idea of the snake cure was curious in the face of Genesis iii, 16; but it was one of the commonest forms of worship in Egypt, and it survives in many places to the present day. This, like the golden calf, was not a new form of

reverence. It was not by any means a novel form of adoration. It presented nothing new or strange to the Hebrews as far as mere external form was concerned. They had seen the cows and they had seen the snake worshipped in Egypt, just as I myself have seen the snake and the crocodile worshipped.

The incident of the golden calf is a characteristic example of the vicissitudes that present themselves in the religious evolution of the Hebrews which advanced slowly through long centuries before it was prepared for apostolic times, the advent of Christianity, and the preparation of the New Testament.

At the conclusion of this Address the Rev. Dr. Curtis, in a few choice sentences, spoke of the new era in Bible distribution upon which we are now entering, and of the greatness of the work before the Society. "Our message is from Heaven. It brings to us and to all men the great truth of an Atonement for the sin of man, and emphasizes the glorious mission of the Great Intercessor. We, like Lady Macbeth, have a red right hand. What can wash those hands? Can Buddha, Mahomet or Confucius wash the red right hand? That Bible that is so dear to us must be sent to others, to show them the marvellous and only remedy. We who value it for ourselves, let us show our appreciation, and pass it on to those who live under Brahmanism, Buddhism and Confucius."

Sir William MacGregor in responding to a vote of thanks gave the meeting an interesting sequel to the well-known story of the presentation of a Bible by the late Queen Victoria to an African potentate, as the answer to the Chief's enquiry "What is the secret of England's greatness?"

Two years ago Sir William MacGregor had the honour to receive the command of the King to present an African Chief to His Majesty at Buckingham Palace. The King received the African Prince in state seated on the throne; and with the dignity and kindness that is characteristic of His Majesty, the King addressed to the Chief words of approval and encouragement. The Chief replied in a brief speech, couched in loyal and picturesque language. He mentioned among other things how His Majesty's royal mother, Queen Victoria, had presented a Bible to his (the chief's) father, and how that gift had been treasured by the recipient and his people. It later occurred to Sir William that it was strange that though he had often visited the Chief in his own home he had never seen that Bible. On making inquiry he learned that it had been burned during an invasion of the Chief's country by the King of Dahomey. This became the subject of conversation one day between Sir William and the Hon'ble Maude Stanley, sister of the late Dean, when Miss Stanley said "Why do you not ask the King to give a Bible to this

Chief also?" To this Sir William replied: "You are just the person to bring the matter to the knowledge of the King." The Chief was to leave for Africa four days after this conversation. Sir William and the Chief were already in a railway carriage at St. Pancras station in London, starting for Liverpool, when, as a result of the action taken by Miss Stanley, a parcel was handed to Sir William containing a Bible, with a suitable inscription, with a note by which he received the King's command to present the Bible in the name of His Majesty to the departing Chief. It would be difficult to exaggerate the joy and delight of the Chief on learning this.

The Bible was formally presented by Sir William to the Chief at Liverpool. With great pride the latter shewed his treasure to his countrymen, beginning at Sierre Leane on his arrival there. That Bible is now, and will be, regarded as the most valuable of the possessions of the Chief and people of Abeokuta.

Sir William concluded by saying "Remember that the Bible is still the secret of England's greatness, and that its distribution is one of the special duties of the British Empire."

The note alluded to above, which has a historical interest was as follows:—

"General Sir Dighton Probyn, Keeper of the Privy Purse, presents his compliments to Sir William MacGregor, and sends him, by command of the King, the accompanying Bible, which His Majesty requests Sir William will be good enough to give to the Alake of Abeokuta as a present from His Majesty to replace the Bible given to the Alake's father by Queen Victoria, and which was destroyed in a fire some twenty years ago."

July 7th, 1904."



Chapter 1. The first part of the book is devoted to a general survey of the history of the English language. It begins with a discussion of the early forms of the language, such as Old English, Middle English, and Modern English. It then goes on to discuss the influence of other languages on English, particularly Latin and French. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the English language in the United States and Canada.

Chapter 2. This chapter is devoted to a detailed study of the English language in the United States. It begins with a discussion of the English language in the early years of the United States, and then goes on to discuss the influence of other languages on English in the United States. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the English language in the United States today.

Chapter 3. This chapter is devoted to a detailed study of the English language in Canada. It begins with a discussion of the English language in the early years of Canada, and then goes on to discuss the influence of other languages on English in Canada. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the English language in Canada today.

EBK. 73

61555329

